



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/545,581

11/28/2006

Yuichi Hori

SUPP-P01-006

5443

28120 7590 08/14/2008

ROPES & GRAY LLP
PATENT DOCKETING 39/41
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

EXAMINER

WANG, CHANG YU

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1649

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-9, and 20, drawn to an insulin-producing cell derived from a neural or neuroendocrine stem cell and a cell composition comprising insulin-producing cells.

Group II, claim(s) 10-16, 18, 19, and 21-23, drawn to a method for making a cell composition comprising cells responsive to treatment with an islet cell differentiation factor or a method for producing insulin-producing cells.

Group III, claim(s) 27-30, 40 and 45-53, drawn to a method of ameliorating a condition related to insufficient pancreatic function by administering to a subject an effective amount of insulin-producing cells.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The 1st claimed invention is drawn to an insulin-producing cell derived from a neural or neuroendocrine stem cell and a cell composition comprising insulin-producing cells. As found in the International Search Report, the Invention of the Group I was found to have

Art Unit: 1649

no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art of Zulewski et al. (see p. 521, abstract, Diabetes, 2001, 50:521-533 as in IDS). Zulewski et al. teach insulin-producing cells derived from neural or neuroendocrine stem cells, which meet the limitation of the claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is anticipated by Zulewski et al.. Since the 1st claimed invention has no special technical feature, it cannot share a special technical feature with the other claimed inventions. Thus, Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when view over the prior art, they do not have a single inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

In addition Group I is directed to a technical feature of insulin-producing cells. Group II is directed to a technical feature of a method for making a cell composition comprising cells responsive to treatment with an islet cell differentiation factor or a method for producing insulin-producing cells. Group III is directed to a technical feature of a method of ameliorating a condition related to insufficient pancreatic function by administering to a subject an effective amount of insulin-producing cells. Therefore, the above Inventions do not share a common special technical feature as they comprise different steps and utilize different products, which demonstrates that each method has a different mode of operation and use of structurally and functionally divergent materials. For example, a method for treating patients does not have a same corresponding technical feature as that in a method of making insulin-producing cells because the patients are not required in the method of making insulin-producing cells. Accordingly, Groups I-III are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special

technical feature within meaning of PCT Rule 13.1 so as to form a single general inventive concept.

Species Election

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

i. If Groups II or III is elected, Applicant is required under PCT Rule 13.2 to elect a single disclosed species of additional factor selected from A) IGF-1/IGF-1 agonist, B) PI3K inhibitor, C) butyric acid, D) activin, E) GDF-8, F) GDF-11 or G) hedgehog antagonist recited in claims 23 and 53 for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

4. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical features of these species are different because each specific species differs with respect to its composition and structures. Consequently the responses to different biomolecules are also different in different types of cells. Therefore, these species do not share a common corresponding technical feature; and thus lack unity of invention.

5. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). In order to be fully responsive, Applicant is required to elect a single group from designated Groups I-III and a single species from group i that is applicable as set forth above to which the claims will be restricted, even though the requirement is traversed. The subject matter for examination will be restricted to the extent of the subject matter of the elected group and species.

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

Art Unit: 1649

are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this general application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600, Group 1649 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Should applicant wish to FAX a response, the current FAX number for Group 1600 is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chang-Yu Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4521. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

Art Unit: 1649

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker, can be reached at (571) 272-0911.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Christine J Saoud/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

/CYW/
Chang-Yu Wang, Ph.D.
August 4, 2008